

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Please substitute the enclosed one (1) sheet of formal drawings, labeled “1/8,” and “Replacement Sheet,” for the corresponding drawings originally filed in the application.

Fig. 1 objected to in that the drawing should be designated prior art. The enclosed Fig. 1 has been amended to include a legend stating “Prior Art.”

In view of the replacement drawings, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's recognition of Applicants' invention by the allowance of claims 31-51 and the indication of allowable subject matter for claims 9-12, 19-24, 29 and 30 is gratefully acknowledged.

Applicants are also grateful for the rescinding of the restriction requirement.

Claim 1 is amended to more particularly point out that the signal coupling device comprises a field coupling device and that the field coupling device includes a ground plane, a microstrip line, a dielectric base, and a communication circuit, features originally recited in claims 8 and 9, now cancelled.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the field coupling device includes a ground plane, a microstrip line, a dielectric base, and a communication circuit, features originally recited in claim 19, now cancelled.

The dependency of claims 10, 13, 20 and 23 are corrected following the cancellation of intervening claims.

Claim 26 is made dependent upon claim 10, and so makes reference to the slot called out in claim 10. Claim 27 is made dependent upon claim 20, and so makes reference to the slot called out in claim 10.

*Claim Rejection under 35 USC § 112*

Claims 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 112 as indefinite in that the claims lack a proper antecedent basis for reference to the slot. The claims have been amended to depend upon claims 10 and 20, respectively, and so refer to the slot called

out therein.

Therefore, it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

*Claims Rejection under 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1, 2, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over United States Patent No. 7,092,403, issued to Takeuchi et al. in 2006, in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0048716, by Gough et al.

Claims 18 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. in view of Gough et al. and United States Patent No. 6,023,244, issued to Snygg.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of United States Patent No. 4,408,285, issued to Sisson et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,941,576, issued to Amit.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of Snygg.

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al., Gough et al. and Snygg in view of United States Patent No. 5,101,171,

issued to Redmond.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,526,510, issued to Kori.

Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,452,115, issued to Tomioka.

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Takeuchi et al. and Gough et al. in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0072329 by Bandeira.

In view of the amendments to the claims, it is believed that the several rejections may be addressed together and are rendered moot.

Claim 1 is directed to a vehicular communications network and is amended to call for a field coupling device comprising a ground plane, a microstrip line, a dielectric base and a communication circuit. As acknowledged in the Office Action by the indication of allowable subject matter, a field coupling device with these features is not taught or suggested by the references.

Claims 2-7 and 13-17 are dependent upon claim 1 and so not taught or suggested at least for the reasons set forth with regard to that claim.

Claim 18 is amended to call for a field coupling device having features similar to

claim 1, and so is also not shown by the references. It follows that dependent claims 25-28 also are not suggested by the references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed.

*Conclusion*

Claims 10-12, 20-24, 29 and 30 were objected to as dependent upon rejected base claims. In view of the amendments and remarks herein, it is believed that the base claims are now allowable. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection be withdrawn, and that all claims be allowed.

If it would further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the phone number provided.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0831.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas D. Fekete  
Reg. No. 29,065  
Delphi Technologies, Inc.  
Legal Staff – M/C 480-410-202  
P.O. Box 5052  
Troy, Michigan 48007-5052

(248) 813-1210